

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, reexamination and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

At the outset, it is respectfully noted that the present application claims the benefit of foreign priority to Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-092009, filed March 29, 2000. In support thereof, a Claim for Convention Priority and a certified copy of the priority document was filed in the Patent Office on September 19, 2002. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

By the above amendments, product claims 1-18 have been canceled and new method claims 19-27 have been added which are directed to methods for producing an antiglare film. Support for new claims 19 and 22-27 can be found in the specification at page 1, lines 3 and 4, taken in connection with originally filed claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11. Support for new claims 20 and 21 can be found in the specification at least from page 16, line 10 to page 17, line 8.

In the Official Action, claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,074,741 (*Murata et al*). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Murata et al* in view of Japanese Patent Document No. 03184072 (*JP '072*). These rejections are moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-6. Moreover, for at least the following reasons, *Murata et al* and *JP '072* do not disclose or suggest each feature of the presently claimed invention.

According to one aspect of the present invention as defined by claim 19, a method is provided for producing an antiglare film comprising a transparent support having thereon an antiglare layer. The method comprises forming an antiglare layer and rubbing the surface of the antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer. Advantageously, employing such a rubbing step can, for example, result in an antiglare film having satisfactory properties relating to antiglare, white tinting and transmitted image clarity (specification at page 40).

Murata et al does not disclose or suggest each feature of one aspect of the present invention as defined by claim 19. For example, *Murata et al* does not disclose or suggest a method for producing an antiglare film which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer. In this regard, the Patent Office has taken the following position at page 3 of the Official Action:

With regards to the limitations that the antiglare layer is subjected to a rubbing treatment, the Examiner takes the position that the determination of patentability for product claims containing process limitations is based on the product itself and not on the method of production.

As discussed above, the present application presently includes claims to methods for producing an antiglare film. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Patent Office must consider for patentability purposes the claimed step of rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer.

Murata et al discloses an antiglare material which is suitable for use in image displays such as a liquid crystal display and a cathode-ray tube and particularly imparts glare-reduction, chemical resistance, abrasion resistance and resistance to stains (col. 1, lines 6-10). However,

Murata et al does not disclose or suggest that the antiglare material thereof is produced by a method which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer. *Murata et al* simply has no disclosure or suggestion of such a method step.

Murata et al does disclose at column 17 tests for evaluating the chemical and stain resistance of the antiglare material thereof. The chemical resistance test includes soaking a swab with isopropyl alcohol and rubbing the roughened surface layer of the antiglare material with the swab (col. 17, lines 13-17). The stain resistance test includes dropping a drop of rapeseed oil on the roughened surface layer of the antiglare material and reciprocatorily rubbing the surface (col. 17, lines 24-27). While such chemical and stain resistance tests include rubbing the antiglare material, such tests are not steps in a method for producing an antiglare film. Quite to the contrary, the rubbing processes disclosed by *Murata et al* relate to the evaluation of the chemical and stain resistance properties of the antiglare material.

JP '072 fails to cure the above-described deficiency of *Murata et al*. In this regard, the Patent Office has relied on *JP '072* for disclosing "an antireflection film comprising a layer of a high refractive index monomer such as vinyl naphthalene and having a high ray transmittance, a good yield at the time of production and long-term stability." However, like *Murata et al*, *JP '072* does not disclose or suggest a method for producing an antiglare film which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer.

For at least the reasons discussed above, *Murata et al* and *JP '072* do not anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by PCT Publication No. WO 97/30021 (*WO '021*). This rejection is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1 and 8-11. Moreover, for at least the following reasons, *WO '021* does not disclose or suggest each feature of the presently claimed invention.¹

WO '021 does not disclose each feature of one aspect of the present invention as defined by claim 19. For example, *WO '021* does not disclose a method for producing an antiglare film which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer. As discussed above, the Patent Office must consider such claimed step for patentability purposes.

WO '021 discloses a reflection reducing film and fluorine-containing monomer compositions which can be used as a starting material for such film (*Yoshida et al* at col. 2, lines 18-22). However, *WO '021* has no disclosure or suggestion that the reflection reducing film thereof is produced by a method which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer.

WO '021 does disclose tests for evaluating the abrasion resistance of the reflection reducing film thereof. The abrasion resistance test of *WO '021* includes rubbing the reflection reducing film with steel wool (*Yoshida et al* col. 18, lines 19-26). While the abrasion resistance

¹The Examiner has apparently relied on U.S. Patent No. 6,254,973 (*Yoshida et al*) as an English language equivalent of *WO '021*. Accordingly, in the following discussion relating to the §102(b) rejection over *WO '021*, citations have been made to *Yoshida et al*.

test includes rubbing the reflection reducing film, such test is not a step in a method for producing an antiglare film. Quite to the contrary, the rubbing process disclosed by *WO '021* relates to the evaluation of the abrasion resistance property of the antiglare material.

For at least the reasons discussed above, *WO '021* fails to anticipate the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,033,743 (*Suzuki et al*). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Suzuki et al* in view of *JP '072*. These rejections are moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1, 2 and 5-7. Moreover, *Suzuki et al* and *JP '072* fail to disclose or suggest each feature of the presently claimed invention for at least the following reasons.

Suzuki et al does not disclose or suggest each feature of one aspect of the present invention as defined by claim 19. For example, *Suzuki et al* does not disclose or suggest a method for producing an antiglare film which includes rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer. As discussed above, the Patent Office must consider such claimed step for patentability purposes.

Suzuki et al discloses a method for producing an antireflection film containing ultrafine particles (col. 8, lines 13 and 14). In this regard, *Suzuki et al* discloses coating a resin composition on a transparent substrate film, drying the coating and irradiating the coating with an ionizing radiation to cure the coating, thereby preparing an antireflection film (col. 8, lines 15-30). It is clear that *Suzuki et al* has no recognition or suggestion of producing the antireflection film thereof by rubbing the surface of an antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer, as is presently claimed.


JP '072 fails to cure the above-described deficiency of *Suzuki et al.* The Patent Office has relied on *JP '072* for disclosing "an antireflection film comprising a layer of a high refractive index monomer such as vinyl naphthalene and having a high ray transmittance, a good yield at the time of production and long-term stability." However, like *Suzuki et al.*, *JP '072* does not disclose or suggest a method for producing an antiglare film which includes rubbing the surface of the antiglare layer or the surface of a layer positioned above the antiglare layer.

For at least the above reasons, *Suzuki et al.* and *JP '072* fail to anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 
Roger A. Lee
Registration No. 46,317

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: February 3, 2003